

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,031	11/13/2003	Daniel Suraqui	1763	6201
62433 7590 EDWARD LANGI		EXAMINER		
c/o SHIBOLETH	YISRAELI ROBER	SHAPIRO, LEONID		
EMPIRE STATE BUILDING, 60TH FLOOR 350 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10118			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	,
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	ERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTE	ıs	12/19/2006	PAI	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/706,031	SURAQUI, DANIEL
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Leonid Shapiro	2629
Davia	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA resisions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tircuit apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Second</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposit	ion of Claims		
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-22,26 and 28-36 is/are pending in the state of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 1-22,26 and 28-35 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 36 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
	ot(s) Dee of References Cited (PTO-892) Dee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/706,031

Art Unit: 2629

Claim Objections

1. Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 26 depends on canceled claim 25.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US Patent No. 6,810,271 B1).

Wood et al. teaches a hardware keyboard for use with an electronic device (See Col. 1, Lines 6-8) comprising three concentric circles (See Fig. 4, items 56,68,70,72,74,from Col. 3, Line 52 to Col. 4, Line 4) wherein at least one of the keys of said keyboard comprises two characters (See Fig. 2, items 2,a,b,c, Col. 3, Lines 1-4), said keyboard further comprising means for generating a bi-dimensional input pattern for a word inputted using keystrokes and for recognizing the inputted word based on said bi-dimensional input pattern (See Col. 3, Lines 9-17).

Application/Control Number: 10/706,031 Page 3

Art Unit: 2629

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-22,26,28-35 are allowed.

Relative to independent claim 1 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Niemeier and Ilan et al.) and the instant invention is that bidimensional input pattern is used in order to determine the identity of the inputted word at least partially based on mathematical monotonous comparisons between said bi-dimensional input pattern and a temporary library of patterns generated from words contained within possible classes of said dictionary database to which the inputted word belongs such that inputted words are identified based on whole word recognition.

Claims 2-19 are depend on claim 1.

Relative to independent claim 20 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Niemeier and Ilan et al.) and the instant invention is

(e) comparing said bi-dimensional input pattern with said temporary library of bi-dimensional patterns in order to identify at least one solution for the inputted word based on whole-word recognition, wherein said comparison is performed at least partially based on monotonous segments comparisons and best matching distance determination.

Claims 1-22,26,28-35 are depend on claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2629

4. Applicant's arguments filed 09/20/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

On page 11, 2nd paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that in contrast to Wood, the present invention does not identify a string of individual letters in order to form the inputted word. Rather, the system of the present invention recognizes inputted words via the unique bi-dimensional input pattern, formed when the user slides the input device from the first letter of the word, to the intermediate letters, and finally to the last letter, without lifting the input device from the keyboard. However, no such limitation in claim 36. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., without lifting the input device from the keyboard) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/706,031

Art Unit: 2629

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Telephone Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,031

Art Unit: 2629

LS 12.01.06

> RICHARD HJERPE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Page 6